

## II. Remarks

Reconsideration and re-examination of this application in view of the following remarks is herein respectfully requested.

After entering this Reply, claims 1, 4-7, 9-14, and 17 remain pending.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102*

Claims 1, 4-7, 9-14, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 88/08972 to Cheung.

A rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that each and every element of the invention is taught in a single reference. However, Cheung does not teach each and every element of the claims. Further, the examiner does not even assert such. In claim 1 and 14, Cheung does not teach and the examiner does not discuss a device for keeping the electrical voltage constant between the source and drain terminals of the field effect transistor. In addition, Cheung does not disclose a calibration device that brings a gate region of the field effect transistor to an electrical calibration potential such that the electric current is independent of parameter fluctuations of the field effect transistor, as denoted in claims 1 and 14.

Claims 4-7, 9-13, and 17 depend from claim 1 or 14 and are, therefore, patentable for at least the same reasons as given above in support of claims 1 and 14.

In addition, claim 6 recites that the evaluation unit has an operational amplifier comprising: a first input, to which the sensor signal can be applied; a second input, to which an electrical reference potential can be applied; and an output, at which the characteristic electrical voltage is provided; the first input and the output being coupled

to one another by means of a nonreactive resistor. Claim 6 is patentable for at least these reasons as well.

In addition, claim 9 recites that the calibration device is set up such that an electric calibration current can be applied to the gate terminal and to one of the source and drain terminal of the field-effect transistor for calibration purposes. Claim 9 is patentable for at least these reasons as well.

Claim 10 recite that the evaluation unit has a correlated double sampling device, which forms, in the case of a sensor event, a value of the electric current that is independent of parameter fluctuations of the field-effect transistor. Claims 10 is patentable for at least these reasons as well.

Claim 11 recites that the correlated double sampling device is set up such that, by means of the correlated double sampling device: in a calibration phase, a gate region of the field-effect transistor is brought to an electrical calibration potential and the associated value of the electric current is detected as a calibration signal and stored; in a detection phase, the value of the electric current on account of a sensor event is detected as a sensor signal; in an evaluation phase, the sensor signal and the calibration signal are evaluated jointly. Claim 11 is patentable for at least these reasons as well.

Claim 12 recites that the sensor devices are arranged essentially in matrix form at least one of on or in the substrate and are connected up by means of row and column lines such that the sensor devices can be driven individually, row by row or column by column. Claim 12 is patentable for at least these reasons as well.

Claim 13 recites that at least one of: at least one calibration device or at least one correlated double sampling device is provided jointly for at least a portion of the sensor devices of a row line or a column line. Claim 13 is patentable for at least these reasons as well.

Finally, claim 17 recites that a value of the electric current that is independent of parameter fluctuations of the field-effect transistor is formed using a correlated double sampling method in the case of a sensor event. Claim 17 is patentable for at least these reasons as well. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

### *Conclusion*

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are patentably distinguishable over the art of record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is requested.

Respectfully submitted by,

Dated: January 5, 2009

/Robert K. Fergan/  
Robert K. Fergan Reg. No. 51,674  
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. Box 10395  
Chicago, IL 60610  
(734) 302-6000